REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-12 are pending in this application. Claims 13-16 are added herein.

The Applicants respectfully request the admittance of this amendment, to place the claims in a better condition for allowance or appeal. The Applicants respectfully suggest that this amendment adds no new matter, and does not require an additional search in view of the subject matter searched in the first and second Office actions.

In the first Office action of 3 October 2002, the Examiner identified Shojima et al. (USP 5,592,656, hereinafter Shojima) as teaching the selection of a font. In response to this assertion, the Applicants distinguished the claimed invention based on the technique used to create a new font. In the second Office action of 25 March 2003, the Examiner identified Cok (USP 6,298,154) as teaching the creation of a new font. Upon review of the prior art, and as detailed below, the claims are amended herein to reestablish that the selection of a font in the Applicants' invention distinguishes this invention from the prior art. Because the selection of a font was the subject matter of the first Office action, the Applicants respectfully suggest that the amended claims require no additional search, and respectfully request admittance of this amendment.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cok (USP 6,298,154). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of amended claims 1, 6, 8, and 9, upon which each of these rejected claims depend.

Each of claims 1, 6, 8, and 9 specifically recite the selection of a font from among a plurality of fonts, based on a comparison of one or more characters in handwritten text to corresponding characters in each of the plurality of fonts. As taught by the Applicants, the particular font that is chosen is one that most closely matches the handwritten input. In the basic embodiment of this invention, the font is chosen from among existing standard fonts, such as Casual, Hyena, and Comic sans MS (Applicants' page 4, lines 2-8). By choosing a standard font, the transmission of 'handwritten' notes is facilitated by transmitting the characters and an identification of the font. The receiving device can then display the characters using the standard font, assuming that the particular font exists at

the receiving display device. If the user creates a new font, it need only be sent to the receiver once; thereafter, this new font is one of the fonts from which the selector selects a font, and the transmitter need only provide the font identifier to the receiver for messages in this font. (Applicants' page 5, line 34 through page 6, line 16.)

Cok specifically teaches the use of a normative font that "represents an ideal, preferred appearance which the individual's handwriting seeks to achieve". The user manually selects the preferred font to use as this normative font. Cok does not teach a system that searches through a plurality of fonts to determine which font most closely resembles the handwritten characters, as specifically taught and claimed by the Applicants.

Because Cok does not teach a selector unit that is configured to select a font from a plurality of fonts based on a comparison of handwritten characters to correspond characters in each of the fonts, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cok.

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, based on the remarks above regarding Cok. Cok neither teaches nor suggests a selector unit that is configured to select a font from a plurality of fonts based on a comparison of handwritten characters to correspond characters in each of the fonts, as specifically claimed by the Applicants.

The Applicants note that the prior font-creating limitations have been removed from the independent claims, and placed in newly created dependent claims 13-16. In the interest of advancing prosecution in this case, the following remarks are submitted regarding the prior art of the first Office Action that had prompted these font-creating limitations.

Upon review of Shojima, the Applicants note that Shojima, like Cok, allows a user to select a particular font to use for display (e.g. "standard font B7" in FIG. 1). However, neither Shojima nor Cok, individually or collectively, teach or suggest a selector unit that selects a font from a plurality of fonts, based on a comparison of

handwritten characters to corresponding characters in each of the plurality of fonts, as specifically taught and claimed by the Applicants.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the present application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. No. 41,508
804-493-0707

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
It is hereby certified that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being:
[ ] deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
[X] transmitted by facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at 703-872-9314.

On ___4 June 2003___   By _____